



Interconnected Violences and Interconnected Resistances: Alliances for Resisting Meat Factories in the Americas

KAREN HUDLET VAZQUEZ

THIS DOCUMENT WAS PREPARED FOR THE TINY BEAM FUND
SUMMITTED ON JULY 2024

Abstract

This Guidance Memo analyzes how diverse civil society organizations in Latin America and the United States resist meat factories which generate multiple interconnected forms of violence. By documenting the views, claims, and actions of environmental, food sovereignty, human rights, and animal rights/vegan organizations against these meat factories, the Memo explores possible alliances and different ways these organizations can connect. By describing the varied forms of resistance and through case studies from the region, the Memo also shows the range of growing resistance against the expansion of meat factories in the Americas.

Acknowledgments

The idea for writing this Guidance Memo started during my PhD studies when I was working with communities and NGOs that were resisting meat factories in Yucatan, Mexico. Through participatory action research anchored in the resistance at the Mayan town of Homun, but expanding to other communities in Yucatan and elsewhere, I got the opportunity to meet amazing people resisting meat factories from different spaces and through diverse actions in Mexico, the United States, Argentina, Chile, and Ecuador. By sharing ideas with them I learned so much about their different perspectives, ideas, and forms of resisting the meat industry.

I want to thank the Guardians of the Cenotes - the grassroots organization in Yucatan resisting the meat industry - whose work and way of thinking influenced my research.

I also want to thank people in multiple organizations and academics whom I have worked together over these last years in the resistance to factory farming, including the Center for Biological Diversity, Waterkeeper Alliance, GRAIN, Earthjustice, Asociación Argentina de Abogados Ambientalistas, Greenpeace Mexico, Slow Food Chile, ARTICLE 19 Mexico and Central America, and Johns Hopkins University.

This Guidance Memo was produced under the Burning Questions Fellowship from the Tiny Beam Fund. The Fellowship supports public scholarship by academics studying the impacts of industrial food animal production in low- and middle-income countries. The Tiny Beam Fund offers multiple grant opportunities for scholars with relevant research interests. For more information, please visit <http://tinybeamfund.org> or email min@tinybeamfund.org



Karen Hudlet Vázquez has a PhD in Geography from Clark University in the United States. Her dissertation focuses on hydrosocial territories and how Mayan communities are resisting the expansion of meat factories in Yucatan, Mexico. Karen received a master's in international development from the University of Utrecht and a BA in international relations from Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM). Her research interests include feminist political ecology, extractives, agribusiness, justice, human rights, and more-than-human and legal geographies. For more than ten years, Karen has worked on environmental justice with different local, national, and international human rights NGOs. Her work has focused on the defense and promotion of economic, social, cultural, and environmental rights against agroextractivism.

Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Key insights	6
3. Framework: Diverse narratives, diverse solutions, and diverse tactics	7
4. Different perspectives of socioenvironmental issues and meat production and (non) consumption	9
4.1 Defining the meat industry; defining the problem	11
4.2 Understanding meat factories as part of a system	12
4.3 The commodification of animals	13
4.4 Multiple and interconnected forms of violence	14
4.5 Diverse views of new technology as part of the solution?	15
4.6 Different ways of (non) consuming meat	16
4.7 Different ways of producing meat?	16
4.8 Summary: How do the organizations understand the meat industry?	18
5. Repertoires of resistance against meat production and/or meat consumption	19
5.1 How are NGOs resisting or contributing to the resistance against meat factories?	19
5.2 Protesting against meat factories	20
5.3 Everyday practices of resistance: other ways of (non) producing industrial meat	21
5.4 Everyday practices of resistance: other ways of (non) consuming meat	21
5.5 Using law against factory farming	22
5.6 Table: Different tactics used by NGOs against meat factories	23
5.7 Case study: “Experimenting” with new tactics	23
6. Resisting together?	26
6.1 Rooting the network	26
6.2 Case study: Sharing knowledge and strategies against pig factories	27
6.3 Case study: The boomerang effect and Ecuador	28
7. Guidance for organizations	30
8. Conclusions	31
9. References	32
10. Annex 1	36

1. Introduction

Meat factories are mega development projects with a number of negative social and environmental impacts affecting human and non-human animals. Given the multiple and interconnected forms of violence in this system of meat production, it is no surprise that it faces resistance and opposition from different actors.

On the one hand, these actors (communities, indigenous people, food movements, vegans, environmentalists, civil society organizations, and social movements) all share a common goal of stopping factory farming. On the other hand, these actors and their approaches to meat production and (non) consumption differ in myriad and significant ways. **Therefore, we cannot assume that they are all natural allies or pursuing a common vision.** The potential tensions between them, and the differences among them, are fruitful objects of study and analysis.

This Guidance Memo analyzes the possible alliances for resisting the expansion of massive meat production by environmental, food sovereignty, human rights, and animal rights/vegan NGOs (non-governmental organizations) in Latin America and the United States. To do so, the Memo considers the main views, positions, and narratives of these organizations, their repertoire of actions to protest or advance their claims, their alternative visions over meat production and (non) consumption, as well as their common and uncommon alliances. It draws on interviews with 31 organizations which are currently undertaking actions against the meat industry.

Moreover, through case studies from the region, it describes how different organizations turn into regional, national, and international alliances and networks to influence others. And by documenting their claims and actions against meat factories, the Memo also reveals the multiple negative impacts of the industry.

This Guidance Memo has four main objectives:

- **First, it identifies how different organizations understand agribusiness and food systems, specifically the meat industry,** and how these visions influence their actions regarding meat production and (non) consumption. In particular, it explores the diverse definitions related to industrial meat articulated by civil society organizations, as well as these organizations' actions and theories of change.

- **Second, it considers collective and coordinated forms of action through case studies.** Describing cases or collaborative actions of groups of NGOs from different realms, the Memo shows what enables the alliances and what could represent obstacles for future collaborations. This also reflects how the different - and sometimes conflicting - visions within the broad movement against factory farming interact with each other.

- **Third, the Guidance Memo discusses scale,** moving from the local to the national, and sometimes international arenas, and then back to the national and local through specific actions.

- **Fourth, the Guidance Memo provides guidance** that will help those resisting meat factories to weave alliances and form better connections.

2. Key insights:

- The way organizations understand the meat industry is complex and influenced by visions regarding economic, social, environmental justice.
- Issues not specifically on meat factories, but related more broadly to food systems and the grain-oilseed-livestock complex (such as the production of genetically modified crops or debates over other forms of producing meat) can cause division among organizations with different focus areas and goals, complicating the formation of alliances.
- Organizations are not monolithic; within an organization, there may be different views and ideas regarding the best ways of resisting factory farming. For instance, leaders of an animal rights organization may believe cultivated meat is the solution to meat factories, but its members may not support cultivated meat because it still involves animal consumption or it is a biotechnological fix that still promotes overconsumption.
- Some organizations are more flexible and able to adapt to local realities, including intersectional and historical exclusion, different forms of livelihoods, as well as variations in the meatification of diets. These local organizations, recognizing and respecting the differences that exist, may take positions that can facilitate the construction of dialogues. That is why in “rooted networks” that take into consideration the specificities of a place, connections that are more respectful of each other can be established. For example, a vegan organization in Peru supports a small production of free-range chickens and works with indigenous communities as a form of resisting factory farming and capitalism, although it may be criticized by other vegan organizations.
- Organizations can mobilize different discourses and different claims over the impacts of factory farming depending on the context and current political opportunities. For instance, environmental issues can be adopted by multiple organizations, as there is a growing openness in judicial systems to recognize the rights to a healthy environment and to protect nature.
- Scaling up resistance against meat factories requires a common goal among actors. Currently, different organizations and alliances focus on different features related to the meat industry. For instance, the Slow Food Movement promotes different local efforts of producing and consuming food, including meat. The Open Wing Alliance promotes animal welfare on an international scale. A thematic alliance is Stop Financing Factory Farming that demands international banks cease investing in the industry.

3. Framework: Diverse narratives, diverse solutions, and diverse actions



Factory farming has numerous environmental and social impacts, and it has become an important issue that is resisted on different fronts and in multiple ways by different actors.

Peasant communities, indigenous people, afro communities and those living in rural and semi-rural areas where the meat factories are located are directly resisting the meat industry as they suffer from the pollution of the soil, air, and water caused by the industry¹.

In addition to local communities, various non-governmental organizations (NGOs) take actions against meat factories. Some of them work in close collaboration with local communities and social movements (rooting the alliances in one or more existing territorial resistances). Others work independently of impacted communities, focusing on different scales and attempting to influence companies, governments, and international organizations and international financing institutions to promote change.

This Guidance Memo focuses on these diverse civil society organizations that work against the meat industry in the Americas. It does not aim to delve into the fundamental work of social movements and grassroots groups (which are nevertheless touched upon to some degree). Its goal is to analyze how a set of actors contribute to challenging the discourse that factory farming is a safe, efficient, and sustainable way of producing meat.

The organizations analyzed for this Guidance Memo are diverse. They differ in scope (local, national, international, or a network of organizations), size of the organization, field of work and expertise, mission and vision, and the degree of involvement in the resistance of industrial meat

¹ Hudlet, 2022

(as an institution or some aspects of it). Although there is a medley of differences among these organizations, they have worked together or come together in joint efforts to achieve specific goals. Nevertheless, alliances are not necessarily easy or smooth.

The Guidance Memo argues that to encourage the possibility of forming alliances among different organizations, one needs to understand their missions, tactics, and multiple visions of meat production and (non) consumption. Their views toward industrial meat production vary as well as their solutions. The different alternatives they espouse are shaped by notions of agrarian and territorial justice, degrowth, and eco-modernism. These views are also influenced by how organizations understand food systems, human rights, justice, development, and human/animal relations. Moreover, tactics differ and adapt to what each organization wants to achieve, its theory of change, and who the stakeholders it wants to influence are (e.g., companies, governments, consumers, development banks).

Although one organization's position may vary from that of another organization, both organizations may share immediate or urgent common goals. Different organizations also have different degree of flexibility in their objectives, missions, and tactics that can open windows for collaboration.

Drawing on the interviews of 31 organizations (environmental organizations, human rights organizations, animal rights /vegan organizations and groups, and organizations or grassroots groups working on food), in the following sections, I will describe their different views of industrial meat farming, the solutions they propose, the stakeholders they aim to influence, and their main tactics.

To analyze the differences and commonalities between the organizations, each of the interviewed organizations in this Guidance Memo² is classified into one of four categories. The classification is based on the focus of the organization. So, one organization can work on more than one issue or aspect of industrial meat farming. The four categories are:

HUMAN RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS

Organizations that work on different issues in human rights, including ESCRs (economic social and cultural rights), rights to information, and indigenous rights.

FOOD SOVEREIGNTY ORGANIZATIONS

Organizations that promote food sovereignty, changes in ways of producing and consuming food, and advocate against the industrialization of food.

ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Organizations working on the environment, environmental rights, climate change, conservation, and biodiversity.

ANIMAL RIGHTS/VEGAN ORGANIZATIONS

Organizations that focus on animal rights (abolitionist and welfare organizations), organizations promoting veganism, and animal sanctuaries.

The following sections first describes the meat industry and its multiple impacts. Then it analyzes the main tactics of resistance against meat factories and the different scales of these efforts.

² For a full list of the organizations please review Annex 1.

4. Different perspectives of socioenvironmental issues and meat production and (non) consumption

In addition to the perspectives of organizations, there are also overarching concepts and approaches that are important for understanding the different ways one can view meat factories, particularly in the Global South. The political ecology approach, and three movements to address socioenvironmental issues are particularly relevant: **ecomodernism, degrowth, and agrarian and environmental justice**.

Political ecology raises the questions of who wins, who loses, and why³ over socioenvironmental conflicts. The political ecology of meat emphasizes power relations in the production of meat and the interactions of human and non-nonhumans⁴. In this approach, meat factories are analyzed according to the distribution of gains and the negative impacts that affect humans and non-human animals.

Ecomodernism, degrowth, and environmental and agrarian justice movements understand the production and the consumption of meat differently and thus propose different solutions to the problem⁵.

For **ecomodernists**, new technologies are the key for solving environmental and social crises and for decoupling production from its environmental impacts. According to this approach, meat factories are seen as efficient, and even sustainable, forms of meat production.

Critics of ecomodernism argue that the use of technology can be seen as a “socioecological fix”⁶ in which one can continue to promote unsustainable production and consumption because new technologies will reduce the negative impacts of producing more. In other words, growth can continue because unsustainable ways of production can temporarily and partially be fixed through technological improvements in meat factories, such as biodigesters and water treatment plants. Nevertheless, these measures that do not solve the problem and encourage capitalism.

Supporters of the degrowth movement are wary of technology and large-scale production. They promote ecological and convivial ways of producing meat and consuming it. The degrowth movement is about bringing “enough to everyone”⁷, and this implies degrowing the consumption

³ Perreault et al., 2015

⁴ Emel & Neo, 2015

⁵ Gómez-Baggethun, 2020; Martínez-Alier, 2023; Robbins, 2020

⁶ McCarthy, 2004

⁷ Gómez-Baggethun, 2020

and production in the Global North and taking into consideration planetary limits. This approach also promotes conviviality, autonomy, and frugal consumption⁸.

For environmental, indigenous and peasant movements from the Global South, they resist the expansion or deepening of the commodity extraction frontiers - including meat production and the meat industry - for noticeably material reasons, including disputes over land and water⁹. Their resistance also advances other ways of producing and consuming food, through, for example, womens' cooperatives, alternative food networks, or agroecology. These forms of resistance also question what development is, and propose alternatives to hegemonic forms of understanding development and different ways of taking care of nature.

Scholars have argued that the ways we produce and consume food reveal the organization of labor, the assignation of value, and the distribution of social production from humans, non-human animals, and nature¹⁰.

	CURRENT ECONOMIC SYSTEM	TECHNOLOGY	CONSUMPTION	PRODUCTION
Ecomodernism	Promotes sustainable development	Technology is perceived as a solution	Can continue if the right technologies are used	New technologies can enable sustainable production (green growth)
Degrowth	There is a need to degrow	Wary of large-scale technology and promotes a different form of organizing technological use	The Global North needs to reduce consumption	Production needs to be reduced and how we produce needs to be changed
Environmental and Agrarian Justice	Proposes alternative forms to development	Discusses who benefits and who suffers from the use of technology	Criticizes the unequal distribution of consumption	Promotes different forms of producing

In short, these different approaches to socioenvironmental problems lead to different positions concerning food systems, specifically meat production. For example, they focus on different elements of environmental justice (distributional, democratic, ontological, and recognition). And their different views of the meat problem and the meat industry translate into different solutions.

8 Kallis, 2018
 9 Martínez-Alier, 2023
 10 McMichael, 2009

Just like the case with these approaches and movements, the organizations included in this Guidance Memo also exhibit differences in the ways they perceive the possible technological solutions (including water treatment plants and biodigesters, genetically modified crops used to feed the animals, and cultivated meat), the ethics of eating or not eating meat, and the different systems of food production.

4.1 Defining the meat industry; defining the problem

All the organizations in this Guidance Memo are against the meat industry in one way or another. But it is hard to go beyond this very general fact to capture how they view and tackle the problem of industrial meat production in a single definition. And there is no single term used by all organizations.

The organizations use a variety of terms and language when they talk about industrialized meat production and their solutions. In addition to their choice of words, they also differ in the kinds of harm done by the meat industry that they want to emphasize (environmental, economic, social, etc.).

Each organization “defines” the meat industry and the problems to be confronted and solved in its own way. This variation in definition is a reflection of the organizations’ diverse views concerning food systems, and their understanding of human and nature relations, as well as justice and socioecological problems. It is also due to the multiple forms of violence, exploitation, commodification, and negative impacts associated with the meat industry.

The meat enterprise is usually defined by its size. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) is a facility with more than 1,000 animal units (an animal unit means an animal equivalent of 1,000 pounds - 453 kilos - live weight), equivalent to 700 dairy cattle, 2,500 swine or 125,000 chickens. **For some groups resisting the meat industry, this technical definition does not capture what the meat production model entails and its multiple negative impacts.**

So, seeking to define the meat industry beyond its size to also include the logic of production, the structure of the industry, and its negative impacts, organizations have selected a variety of terms and expressions that best suit their own purpose. These terms call attention to the differences between the production of industrialized meat and other forms of meat production. These definitions are also aimed at highlighting the exploitation perpetrated by the meat industry - exploitation of humans, animals, and nature.

Last but not least, some of these terms are specific to particular geographical locations. CAFOs is a term mostly used in the United States, but hardly used in Latin America.

4.2 Understanding meat factories as part of a system

Meat factories are part of the grain-oilseed-livestock complex¹¹. The production of industrial meat requires the use of monocrops, such as genetically modified soy and corn, that are associated with deforestation, water and soil pollution, and the generation of multiple health hazards. Under this system, genetically modified crops and meat production are mutually reinforced.

In addition, a meat factory is not an isolated entity, but part of a broader system, where hundreds of meat factories are connected by roads and ports to other facilities, including slaughterhouses and meat processing plants. This form of meat production, backed by the principles and practice of capitalism, has become one of the largest contributors to climate change and drivers of deforestation, water and soil pollution, and land grabbing¹².

Finally, the meat produced in meat factories promotes further meatification of diets through fast-food eateries¹³ and company-owned butcheries that are open every day in most towns and pushing prices down (instead of local butcheries that are open fewer times a week), affecting consumers' diet.

By analyzing industrial meat with a systems approach – such as the EU's recent “farm to fork” strategy to connect food production and consumption – one can see clearly meat factories' connection to a much wider system.

The terms that are used by organizations to refer to the meat industry in Latin America reflect a systems approach and interpretation. One of these terms is **mega meat farms** or **mega meat factories**. This approach associates large scale industrialized production of meat with mega-development projects.

Mega development projects are large-scale forms of investment characterized by extractivist orientations of economic development¹⁴. These projects are also referred to, in Mexico and elsewhere in Latin America, as projects of dispossession and death (*proyectos de muerte*) that perpetuate violence and colonial features¹⁵.

These projects adopt a particular “developmentalist logic” regarding economic development. Using this lens, environmental conflicts related to meat can be seen as disputes about access to land, water, and breathable air to get more biomass, dispossessing peasants, indigenous peoples, and pastoralists¹⁶.

Mega development projects can also be considered to be part of extractive regimes. To do an analysis of “**meat extractivism**”, one would explore who is impacted by meat production, who

¹¹ Weis, 2013

¹² Schneider, 2014

¹³ Foer, 2010

¹⁴ Barruti et al., 2020

¹⁵ Post, 2022

¹⁶ Martínez-Alier, 2023

gets the bulk of the gains, and who consumes the meat. A good example is the case of Argentina where an intended agreement between the government of China and Argentina is aimed at doubling the pork production in Argentina for export by 2024. The project will include 25 operations with 12,000 pigs each¹⁷.

It is important to note the appropriation of natural resources in these schemes that almost always result in an uneven exchange between those who benefit and those who suffer the social and environmental consequences of extraction¹⁸. Critiques against mega development projects and extractives are often informed by concepts of agrarian and environmental justice.

Human rights organizations, environmental organizations, and food sovereignty organizations tend to understand meat factories as mega development projects and agrarian extractivism that are part of the grain-oilseed-livestock complex. It is not surprising that they focus on these projects' multiple and unevenly distributed impacts:

“[By analyzing] the investors in industrial food production, we...find a panorama [in which] everything is integrated, so on the one hand you have money influencing everything and then technology as well. It was increasingly difficult for us to explain what was happening to the environment and biodiversity to the communities without an approach to what the technologies were and then who was investing in the technologies. We do not have a specialization in the meat issue; the meat issue, we approach it because what we are interested in is to demonstrate that there is an enormous concentration in the industrial food sector.” (Food sovereignty organization, 2024).

In other words, fighting against concentration and corporate control of food production is the key point.

And so for these organizations, the definition of meat factories should contain the **capital-intensive character** of the industry as well as its exploitative aspects.

4.3 The commodification of animals

Another way of understanding meat factories stems from factory farming's **commodification of food animals**.

Commodification is understood as a process in which something that previously did not have an economic value is incorporated into the market and is available as an object for sale; this process can alter its inherent quality and relationship with society and nature. In the meat industry, industrialization changes the relationships between humans and animals¹⁹. And the aim - from a political economy perspective - is to modernize the sector to extract greater economic gain. This process is facilitated by specific institutions (including government agencies, global development organizations, agrifood science, and companies). Commodification in factory farming goes beyond non-human animals as it also includes nature.

¹⁷ Kotani et al., 2022

¹⁸ Martinez-Alier & Walter, 2016

¹⁹ Neo & Emel, 2015

A meat factory produces thousands of kilograms of meat and waste, and uses technology under the guise of market efficiency, displacing human labor and bioengineering non-human animals' bodies along the way.

Animal rights /vegan organizations often focus on the commodification and conditions of farmed animals when they oppose meat factories. By exposing the treatment of animals in these facilities they denounce the violence against them and focus on the consequences of commodifying the animals.

Although environmental and human rights organizations would not deny the abuse against animals in meat factories, this is seldom the focus for them. In contrast, vegan and animal rights organizations make visible these abuses. Some food sovereignty organizations also engage with animal wellbeing, linking the treatment of animals to the form of production.

4.4 Multiple and interconnected violences

Sometimes different views of the meat industry are not at opposite ends of each other, but are more a matter of degree or focus.

For instance, within the inter-connected forms of violence and exploitation of humans, animals and nature, different organizations might focus on one form of violence without denying others. Similarly, different organizations might recognize in varying degree that the meat industry is part of a system that has an uneven distribution of benefits and harms. For example, one definition of industrial meat takes into consideration both the structure of the industry and the lack of caring for animals:

“...industrial farms as breeding, rearing, slaughtering, and processing of animals, and/or animal feeding operations involved in the mass production of meat, dairy products and eggs. Usually controlled by multinational corporations, this production involves the breeding and/or rearing of hundreds to hundreds of thousands of animals in concentrated feeding operations (mainly chickens, dairy cows and pigs, and some fish farms), grazing lots (beef cattle) or extensive, controlled grazing systems (beef and dairy cattle) that feed massive, vertically integrated supply chains. These production models do not recognize animals as sentient beings and do not care for their welfare”²⁰.

Nevertheless, there are also points of view that organizations differ more strongly, including the views over technology, forms of production, and consumption.

4.5 Diverse views of new technology as part of the solution?

Different organizations, and the individuals that work within them, have different views over technologies and how they might (or might not) contribute to minimizing some of the negative impacts of the meat industry. The discussions regarding grain production and cultivated meat illustrate these disagreements.

From a food system perspective of meat production, there are important differences between food sovereignty and environmental organizations on the one hand, and vegan organizations on the other, **in relation to how the grains that feed the animals are produced.**

Some vegan organizations do not criticize or remain silent regarding genetically modified corn or soy. Other vegan groups may recognize that genetically modified crops as a problem and explain that by reducing meat consumption the production of these crops will decrease as a result. But there is a lack of agreement among all vegan organizations. In contrast, human rights, food sovereignty, and environmental organizations clearly consider genetically modified crops as a serious part of the problem.

In addition, one current and more controversial issue is the different positions regarding **cultivated meat**. Although some vegan organizations believe this may offer a good solution, the vast majority of other types of organizations - mostly those focusing on food sovereignty - are against the expansion of this technology.

Some of these other organizations argue forcefully how cultivated meat will only benefit a few corporations while having nefarious consequences for society and the environment. For them, cultivated meat will further exclude peasant economies and reproduce the current undesirable outcome of producing industrial meat. Cultivated meat, they claim, also requires massive amounts of energy and therefore will have its own environmental consequences. With all these considerations in mind, they argue that the consumption of meat should decrease among those who consume it the most instead of diverting attention from the problem with a technological fix.

In contrast, some vegan organizations embrace cultivated meat as a solution for people that are transitioning out of or miss eating meat. But there are also other vegan groups who consider cultivated meat as unnecessary and perpetuating meat consumption and animal exploitation.

4.6 Different ways of consuming or (non) consuming meat

Food is intimately related to the ways we care for others (human and non-human), allocate resources, and envision how to live well. For all organizations eating is political, and consumers have, to some extent and depending on whom, a choice.

Food sovereignty organizations promote eating less and better meat. This approach questions our current relationship with food. For instance, traditional cooks in the Global South aim to decolonize food by cooking traditional dishes and recuperating ways of producing and consuming traditional diets that are culturally relevant with ingredients that are locally sourced and produced outside agribusiness. Some of these dishes might include meat.

The slow food movement also aims to recover a relationship with food that is missing nowadays. It embraces the multiple dimensions of eating, including conviviality, taking the time to pause (breaking productivity rhythms), recovering cultural and historical elements of food, as well as strengthening the relationship of producer and consumer. By promoting an agroecological protein transition, the movement aims to attend to varied forms of injustice.

Most animal rights organizations and vegan organizations promote plant-based diets. For some of them, promoting such diets is their sole and only goal. Some vegans may align with food sovereignty organizations as these groups may also promote the consumption of non-animal products that are locally and responsibly sourced. However, other vegan organizations are comfortable with the consumption of industrial and processed foods, as long as they are vegan, as well as with fast food restaurants if they offer vegan options. For instance, vegan organizations might applaud a vegan option at Subway or Starbucks without considering the multiple critics who are against these food chains. In other words, vegan organizations may promote plant-based diets but do not necessarily get involved in how the food is produced or distributed.

4.7 Different ways of (non) producing meat?

Human rights organizations as well as environmental organizations focus their attention on going against industrial meat production and do not oppose - and even defend - small-scale meat production.

For environmental organizations, the focus is on the impacts large facilities have on water and the environment and how this industry is connected to climate change. Similarly, human rights organizations also focus on large-scale facilities as factory farming is linked to numerous human rights violations, including the right to food, the right to a healthy environment, the right to water, the right to health, the right to access information, the rights of children, indigenous rights to a territory and Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC), and violations of the rights of human rights defenders, among a number of other issues.



For food sovereignty organizations, criticizing the mode of production of industrial meat is an integral part of what they do. These organizations present an alternative by promoting “good, clean, and fair food”. They differentiate between food security and food sovereignty, the latter **going beyond the availability of food to also promote the power of people to decide what to consume.** These organizations are keen to highlight the clear distinction in different ways of producing and consuming meat. In the words of a person working in a food sovereignty organization:

“They put in the same bag intensive farming and peasant farming...I think that is one of the issues, in journalistic communication, for example, is to differentiate if we are talking about large-scale intensive breeding farms with overcrowding of animals that generally occupy a great amount of resources, especially water and land, and whose meat is distributed by supermarket... unlike the meat produced in a peasant way which is generally for short food networks or local markets to supply the protein needs of local people...I think that another challenge is to dialogue a little bit more on the different areas of the sector.” (Food sovereignty organization 2024).

For some food sovereignty organizations, in order to emphasize the difference, they encourage projects to produce non-industrial meats as part of peasant and indigenous livelihoods and as part of a food system. Thus, many food sovereignty organizations promote projects of *gallina* and *cerdo criollos*. As a holistic movement they “resist and (r)exist” as they resist *agribusiness* and propose an alternative (Traditional chef, 2024). In short, members of food sovereignty organizations, as well as environmental organizations, tend to separate different systems of meat production into distinct categories.

When asked if they differentiate between industrial and non-industrial meat production, vegan and animal organizations have diverse responses. Although these organizations **condemn all forms of meat production**, many of them acknowledge that small non-industrial meat production is something that “vegan(s)...have to understand... it is an ecosystem and... we need to create a balance”. Another argument they make is that “(they) focus on the largest number of individuals (referring to animals) that suffer, and the largest number of individuals are found in factory farming” (Animal rights organization, 2024). Thus, they should focus their efforts on meat factories. For instance, multiple campaigns advocate against the use of cages.

Even though animal rights organizations are against meat production, they might nevertheless attempt to improve the conditions within the meat factories and slaughterhouses through animal welfare certifications. These certifications could be utilized by the meat industry to cover up and wash off the abuses they inflict on the animals and to promote meat factories.

4.8 Summary: How do the organizations understand the meat industry?

HUMAN RIGHTS DEFINITION

Meat factories are mega projects that violate multiple human and environmental rights, such as the rights to land and territory and autonomy.

FOOD SOVEREIGNTY DEFINITION

Industrial meat is a mode of production that changes the form of producing meat of peasant communities.

Mega meat factories are extractive projects; mega development projects displace our ways of living.

“They are places of suffering, suffering of the territory, of the communities, of the animals.”

ENVIRONMENTAL DEFINITION

“Industrial meat is a sector with multiple environmental impacts such as air and water pollution.”

ANIMAL RIGHTS/VEGAN DEFINITION

“The meat industry is a systematic oppression of millions of animals.”

“It is a corporate monopoly of killing and suffering.”

Overall, meat factories create many health hazards (including pandemics), lead to cruelty to animals²¹, and displace other, more sustainable forms of producing food. As stated in an Argentinian booklet against pig meat factories:

“Pig mega-farms represent another aspect of a socially and environmentally unsustainable and dangerous model that involves the use of billions of liters of water, soil and groundwater contamination, nauseating odors that affect the quality of life of the surrounding population and impacts on the health of workers”²².

But there are multiple ways to define the meat industry – specifically industrialized meat production – as presented above. In spite of the variations, most of them indicate some form of exploitation and violence, as well as conflict. In some cases the industry is scrutinized under the concept of extractivism. Definitions may also refer to particular aspects of the meat production system.

Depending on the organization, the emphasis is put on a form of violence committed by whom (companies, agribusiness, consumers) and committed against whom (workers, impacted communities, animals, nature). These emphases influence the type of actions the organizations take.

²¹ Foer, 2010; Gunderson, 2013

²² Barruti et al, 2020, p.14

5. Repertoires of resistance against meat production and(or) meat consumption

5.1 How are NGOs resisting or contributing to the resistance against meat factories?

There is no single form of protest and resistance because organizations in the Americas have used and experimented with a range of tactics to challenge meat factories.

Some authors have distinguished between overt forms of resistance and everyday forms of resistance²³, and explained how organized resistance can encourage new everyday resistance activities and vice versa²⁴. Others have discussed how resistance and re-existence are both necessary to achieve change. Many of the most studied forms of resistance or protests are overt acts such as demonstrations and blockages. Nevertheless, there are also everyday forms of resistance through practices, such as ways of consuming and eating, or the recreation of “utopias” in certain spaces that are key for resisting industrial meat. Resistance can also take place within, beyond, and against the state.

This Guidance Memo identifies various forms of resistance and tactics of NGOs in the Americas and the movements they work with, including overt protests, everyday forms of resistance, litigation, and advocacy.

Varied perspectives on a problem, such as meat factories, can influence the proposed solutions, and in turn the tactics used by NGOs. Additionally, these tactics are shaped by the mission and vision of the organizations, as well as their past interactions with other stakeholders.

According to academics, repertoires of protest develop over time through interactions between social movements and their antagonists and are influenced by the internal dynamics of a movement as well as economic and political opportunities. Within a particular type of organization some of the tactics and forms of resistance are usually replicated.

²³ Van Den Berg et al., 2021

²⁴ Lilja et al., 2017

5.2 Protesting against meat factories

There are multiple ways to protest - understood as different forms of unconventional participation. In many cases against the meat industry, protest is combined with other actions, such as litigation. Moreover, different groups protest in different ways.

For example, indigenous people and peasant communities have protested factory farming through organizing locally and setting up camps. One of the most famous cases is that in Chile's Freirina community in the Atacama Desert in 2012. Through local mobilization, continuous protest, and forming alliances, the residents managed to close down the pig processing plant there - one of the largest in Latin America - owned by the company Agrosuper. Another example is the ongoing case of the Hope Camp in Sitilpech, Mexico, an indigenous Mayan village. The inhabitants are fighting a mega farm with around 50,000 pigs contractor of Kekén. **It is important to mention that in both cases defenders were repressed.**

In the case of Sitilpech, after the repression, human rights NGOs, including those focusing on human rights defenders, got involved to protect the victims of the abuse. Vegan organizations also protested on specific dates and through performances.



Credit: Freirina consciente

5.3 Everyday practices of resistance: other ways of (non) producing industrial meat

Projects, such as some animal sanctuaries, small scale farms and cooperatives, or other forms of meat production (including peasant and agroecology) can promote conviviality, autonomy, responsible consumption, and food sovereignty; defend common land, air, and water; promote frugal abundance against the meatification of diets; and challenge the main narrative of meat factories as an efficient and sustainable way of producing meat.

As such, they contain elements of the broad political and social objectives of degrowth and opposition to capitalism. They are also expressions of some of the goals of movements that fight for autonomy, and for agrarian, environmental, and indigenous justice.

Various projects of producing meat that are parts of integrated food systems and cooperatives are championed by food sovereignty organizations. And there are a few examples where these organizations and animal rights organizations align. For example, in Peru, there is a project in which the animal rights organization works with small producers of free-range chickens to increase and improve the productivity and animal wellbeing. *“This project is a form of fighting industrial production and started after COVID 19”* (Animal rights organization, 2024).

Agroecological and free-range farms showcase a relationship between humans and animals that is not the same as that in industrial farms. So do sanctuaries for farmed animals. Some of these animals were previously part of the meat industry, and were rescued, for instance, during an accident when they were being transported from one facility to another. These spaces are considered by some members of the animal rights movement to be spaces where “farm animal species can live in freedom”.

5.4 Everyday practices of resistance: other ways of (non) consuming meat

Vegan organizations and food sovereignty organizations promote different diets through events and activities. For example, food fairs, vegan festivals, supporting restaurants, local markets connecting local meat producers with consumers.

In addition to these events that kindle conviviality, some vegan organizations use vegan campaigns and promotions to link food provision with certain segments of society that are often being excluded. For example, a vegan NGO delivered vegan food during the Covid-19 pandemic to social dining facilities.

5.5 Using law against factory farming

In recent years, there has been an increase in the judicialization of politics, understood as the use of law, legal discourse, and litigation by a range of political actors²⁵ in Latin America, including the judicialization of environmental conflicts.

In the realm of resisting the meat industry, human rights and environment NGOs have supported impacted communities through litigation, claiming human rights violations and also utilizing environmental law. These include cases in the United States, Mexico, Ecuador, Chile, and Argentina. In addition, some human rights and vegan organizations have also used litigation to advance animal rights and welfare.



Credit: Rick Dove

Rick Dove
Dove Imaging

²⁵ Huneus et al., 2010; Sieder, 2020; Sieder et al., 2005

5.6 Table: Different tactics used by NGOs against meat factories

TYPE	ACTIONS	ANIMAL RIGHTS/ VEGAN NGOS	ENVIRONMENTAL NGOS	FOOD SOVEREIGNTY NGOS	HUMAN RIGHTS NGOS
PROTEST	Marches	Relevant and coordinated protests to promote animal rights	Organize and participate in protests related to environmental issues	Protests in local communities to oppose pig factories	Support protests and the right to protest
	Vigils	Vigils next to slaughterhouses or in public places to commemorate the killing of animals			
	Performances	Performances are used to raise awareness of issues regarding animal welfare, for example the “human meat tray”	Performances are used to raise awareness of environmental issues		Theater was used to raise awareness of the consequences of pig factories in a territory
RESEARCH	Research	Undercover research in factory farms, research on food production and consumption	Research on the socio-environmental impacts of factory farming Research on industry financing	Research on the socio-environmental impacts of factory farming. Research on new technologies and on the sector’s structure and concentration.	Research on the impacts of the meat industry on human rights Research on industry financing
EVERYDAY FORMS OF RESISTANCE	Sanctuaries	Animals that are saved from the meat industry or abandoned are kept in safe spaces			
	Food markets, fairs and festivals	Vegan festivals to promote vegan diet		Markets, food baskets, food fairs are used to promote meat that is not produced in factories.	
	Traditional chefs			Work with traditional chefs to promote traditional dishes	
	Workshops on food production	Workshops to produce food agroecologically were taught, sometimes in some sanctuaries		Many knowledge sharing and exchanges take place to share different ways of producing meat	

5.6 Table: Different tactics used by NGOs against meat factories

TYPE	ACTIONS	ANIMAL RIGHTS/ VEGAN NGOS	ENVIRONMENTAL NGOS	FOOD SOVEREIGNTY NGOS	HUMAN RIGHTS NGOS
ADVOCACY	Advocacy with governments	Work on government and legislation to promote animal protection	Work on government and legislation to promote environmental standards	Work on government and legislation to promote food protection	Work on government and legislation to promote human rights
	Advocacy with companies	Agreements with companies to improve animal well-being and with restaurants and retailers to change their buying preferences. Promote vegan alternatives in food value chains.	Some organizations engage in pressuring companies to respect environmental rights		Some organizations engage in pressuring companies to respect human rights.
	Advocacy with funders, including development banks	Some organizations have pressured banks and funders to stop financing factory farming	Some organizations have pressured banks and funders to stop financing factory farming	Some organizations have pressured banks and funders to stop financing factory farming	Some organizations have pressured banks and funders to stop financing factory farming
COMMUNICATION	Social media	Social media campaigns that promote plant-based diets, denounce animal abuses. Multiple messages from celebrities.	Social media campaigns on the environmental impacts of the meat industry	Social media campaigns promoting other ways of consuming and producing food	Social media campaign on cases of human rights abuses linked to the meat industry
	Campaigns	Campaigns to promote vegan diet and animal welfare	Campaigns linking environmental issues with meat production	Campaigns promoting other ways of consuming and producing food	Broad citizen consultation strategies (Argentina)
LITIGATION	Litigation	Some organizations have started to use litigation regarding the meat industry, most cases have been related to the well-being of non-farm animals	Environmental litigation is increasingly used to challenge projects such as meat factories that have negative impacts	Litigation can be used to promote some native foods and against food technologies, such as GMO and meat factories	Human rights organizations have used litigation for many years, and recently more cases against meat factories

Factors that determine what type of protest to mount can be influenced by internal processes within an organization as well as external circumstances, such as political opportunities and resources on offer. In a number of cases an organization or a group of organizations replicate the same actions. And organizations can often learn from each other and replicate strategies. However, some tactics are specific to a certain type of organizations, such as the vegan movement's vigils.

5.7 Case study: “Experimenting” with new tactics



Credit: Mariana Beltrán @m4rvoican

Using environmental laws to fight pig farms is one strategy that is very relevant to our discussion of new tactics. Currently in Yucatan different alliances have been pushing for the use of less common avenues in environmental law to fight pig factories there.

One example has been the request for a Ramsar (Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat) mission to look into the pollution of factory farming against the cenotes there. In 2024 Mercy for Animals Latin America launched a project to team up with different actors to urge the Environmental Ministry (SEMARNAT) to request an advisory mission to verify the status of the internationally protected wetlands of Yucatan. The visit could halt the expansion of pig, egg, and chicken mega farms in the Yucatan.

No matter what new tactics are explored, it is worth reiterating that views regarding working with, beyond, and against the state and/or companies are rooted in different understandings of food systems, previous experiences and missions of the organizations concerned. For instance, some perceive the vegan movement as one that provides only a partial solution. A human rights NGO argues that “territorial defense is a more holistic approach to the problem”. Nevertheless, there is room for alliances. In the next section, I will explore the possibilities of rooting alliances and considering the terms of connection.

6. Resisting together?

The resistance against meat factories takes place at different scales, including in the form of an individual human body through the visceral decision of what to eat, all the way from local, national, regional, to international scales. Many of these actions come from alliances and networks that are often rooted to a local resistance against a particular meat factory.

The framework of rooted networks²⁶ is useful for understanding the terms of engagement among diverse organizations. It is based on four main principles: 1) accept the different perspectives regarding humans and non-humans; 2) acknowledge that networks are connected to territories; 3) analyze the assorted views about nature; and 4) examine the multiple nodes and types of power that exist in the networks²⁷.

In the previous sections, I have analyzed the different positions toward meat factories and described the repertoire of resistance of environmental, human rights, food sovereignty, and animal rights/vegan organizations. In this section, using the rooted networks approach, I will analyze their interactions and terms of connection. To do so, I will refer to different cases in Latin America.

6.1 Rooting the network

The impacts of meat factories are felt in concrete places and expand to different sites. Depending on their respective objectives, different NGOs may collaborate or not with territorial movements or with those communities and groups that are directly affected by the meat industry.

In a number of cases human rights organizations, whose usual focus is not on acting against meat factories, got involved in the resistance because this type of mega development project causes multiple harms to communities and nature that are human rights violations.

“Accompanying the communities in Yucatan did not begin as a process against the industry, but rather it was part of accompanying communities that are defending their land and their territory...(In the community) the construction of a mega poultry farm is planned... So, a series of conversations began with the ejidatarios (communal land owners)... The case is more linked to the defense of the territory and the natural assets of the communities than fighting the industry” (Human rights NGO, 2024).

In other cases, human rights organizations were drawn in to defend the right to protest when communities protesting meat factories suffered from threats or attacks. There are also examples in which human rights organizations were involved in the defense of the right to food and the rights of peasant and indigenous communities to engage in their own ways of producing food. This is particularly significant as the coexistence between factory farming and other systems

²⁶ Rocheleau & Roth, 2007

²⁷ Cantor et al., 2018

of producing food – including meat – may not be compatible with each other. Environmental organizations also accompany local communities in their cases against the meat industry.

For those organizations that are not rooted in cases impacting a territory, contacts with territorial movements can influence their ideas and perceptions. For instance, a vegan activist who was part of a vegan organization described how getting involved and visiting directly the protest camps of communities resisting a pig factory changed her urgency and her views on the need to build local alliances.

6.2 Case study: Sharing knowledge and strategies against pig factories

In many countries, meat factories have become the dominant form of animal agriculture, and there are signs that this model is spreading in Latin America. Given this situation, in mid-2020, a group of environmental and human rights organizations started to meet to think collectively about the expansion of pig factories.

The first event took place in September 2020, and it was a legal clinic to discuss the case of a 49,000-pig factory in Homún, Yucatán, México. The Mayan community, dedicated to supporting the ecotourism of cenotes, had started multiple lawsuits against the pig factory. Legal clinics are commonly organized by NGOs to share ideas on different arguments and tactics to improve legislation and advance litigation. The legal clinic on the case of the mega pig farm was co-organized by environmental and human rights NGOs, including the local NGO Indignación, the Business and Human Rights Resource Center (BHRRC), Greenpeace México, and the Boell Foundation. Organizations from Spain, Mexico, Argentina, and the US also joined to share their experiences and cases. After the legal clinic, the organizations decided to host a tri-lingual

(English, Spanish and Mayan) three-day online webinar to discuss pig factories. The “International Seminar: Resisting Pig Farms” was co-organized by Indignación, BHRRC, Greenpeace Mexico, K’anan ts’onot (the Guardians of the Cenotes of Homún), the Argentinian Association of Environmental Lawyers, the Coastal Carolina Riverwatch Alliance, and the Center for Biological Biodiversity. The sessions were: Pig farms landscape and resistance spaces; Environmental impacts of pig farms and academic’s and civil society’s evidence to pollution; Alternatives to CAFOs – Animal rights and alternative ways of producing and (not) consuming meat.

Presenters came from impacted communities, academia, civil society groups in the US and Mexico. This seminar that took place during the Covid-19 pandemic resulted in collaboration and support for the case in Homún. An amicus was drafted by multiple organizations describing the socioenvironmental impacts of pig factories²⁸. After the seminar, the network held periodic meetings, and their efforts concentrated on pushing for initiatives that criticize the consequences of pig factories in the

INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR: RESISTING PIG FARMS
9 AM MEXICO CITY 10 AM NEW YORK 11 AM BUENOS AIRES

Objective: To exchange experiences regarding the social and environmental impacts of large-scale pig farms, actions of resistance, and possible alternatives to CAFOs.

ZOOM: <https://zoom.us/j/9675684662?pwd=U3ZlTlRmetK3hNVDY5ZCpUUT09>

There will be translation from/to English / Spanish / Mayan

THURSDAY, MAY 6:
The pig farm landscape and resistance spaces

Larry Baldwin, Crystal Coast Waterkeeper, USA
Shari White-Williams, North Carolina Conservation Network, USA
Nasima Muhammad, North Carolina Environmental Justice Network, USA
Krisa Kassarman, Food and Water Watch, USA
Doroteo Hui K'uk, Guardians of cenotes in Homún, Mexico

THURSDAY, MAY 20:
Environmental impacts of pig farms: civil society and academic evidence on water and soil pollution

Dr. JoAnn Burkholder, North Carolina State University, USA
Dr. DiAnn Williams, Center for a Livable Future in 2020, Johns Hopkins University, USA
Dr. Yamil Aguilar-Quintero, National Institute of Forestry, Agricultural and Livestock Research, Mexico
Rafael Colombo, Argentine Association of Environmental Lawyers, Argentina

THURSDAY, JUNE 3:
Alternatives to CAFOs: Animal rights and alternative ways of producing and (not) consuming meat

Atlano Ceballos Loza, School of Agroecology U Vitz K'ot, Mexico
Eulalia del Socorro Mox Yoh, Women groups producing crocheted pigs, Mexico
Yviana Lazaro, Greenpeace Mexico
Pabla Salmeron, Mercy for Animals

Duration of each session: 2 hours

Logos: Indignación, BHRRC, Greenpeace, and others.

Americas. This included knowledge sharing and international advocacy. A group of organizations from the region followed up an initiative first taken by a Mexican organization, and then by Mexican and Argentinian partners, and expanded with the petition for a thematic hearing before the Inter- American Human Rights Commission. Multiple petitions for a thematic hearing have been presented before the IAHRRC since then, but that has yet to be granted²⁹.

In addition to the International Seminar, in May 2022 a three-day in-person workshop took place in Homún with the objective of weaving alliances and sharing experiences of organizations and communities in the Americas against mega pig factories. Different communities from Yucatan participated in the workshop as well as representatives from NGOs and academia in the US, Argentina, Chile, and Ecuador. Based on the results of discussions from the event, a declaration was published and presented at an academic forum³⁰. Afterwards, the group continued with online meetings, although only organizations attended.

6.3 Case study: The boomerang effect and Ecuador

There has been an increase in advocacy campaigns and actions to request **international development banks** to be more responsible when considering projects that are connected to human rights violations.

In the past ten years, the five principal public **development banks** have invested more than \$4,500 million to finance industrial livestock³¹. Part of this funding is going to countries in Latin America. For instance, between 2018 and 2021, IDB (International Development Bank) invested around \$500 million in the meat industry in Latin America and the Caribbean³².

In Ecuador, the food company Pronaca has more than 30 meat factories of pigs and chickens in Santo Domingo de los Tsáchilas³³. Communities there have denounced the company for contaminating rivers, ruining the environment and people's health. They have taken various actions in collaboration with other actors. These included litigation and making reference to human rights violations using the complaint mechanisms of international financial bodies.

In 2009, the Constitutional Court led to the creation of an inter-institutional commission with the objective of monitoring Pronaca's industrial activity in relation to the use of water and waste disposal. However, the commission did not conduct a proper analysis of the water in the impacted rivers.

Between 2004 and 2013, IFC provided \$120 million to Pronaca. In 2021, despite complaints of community members and the Covid-19 pandemic, IFC awarded an additional loan of \$50 million to Pronaca³⁴.

²⁹ ARTICLE 19, Mexico and Central America, et al. 2022

³⁰ Declaración América sin fábricas de cerdos, 2023

³¹ León Vega & Bravo, 2023

³² McNamara et al., 2023

³³ León Vega & Bravo, 2023

³⁴ CEDENMA, 2023

In 2023, in support of the impacted communities, CEDENMA (Coordinadora Ecuatoriana de Organizaciones para la Defensa de la Naturaleza y el Medio Ambiente) submitted a report documenting the many environmental and social impacts of Pronaca's operation. The report criticizes how IFC and IDB Invest have not adequately enforced their standards or mandates with respect to adverse environmental and social effects. Afterwards, the Inter-American Development Bank's Independent Consultation and Investigation Mechanism (MICI) formally accepted the complaint by the indigenous communities.

Both examples - Homún and Santo Domingo de los Tsáchilas - are rooted in specific territories through which alliances were woven. Different organizations provided different forms of support to the territorial resistances at different moments. And in both cases there was a common goal and a degree of agreement regarding strategies.

7. Guidance for organizations

1. There are still few alliances made by vegan or animal rights organizations with groups that focus on human rights, the environment, or food sovereignty.

Past collaborations have been rooted in specific cases (such as the case in Yucatan) where resisting pig factories or octopus factories have prevailed. These experiences have resulted in interesting networks and innovations.

For alliances such as these to work, there needs to be openness to accepting the various ways different stakeholders look at meat production and consumption and (non) consumption. Members of local vegan organizations - which are closer to the impacted communities - may be more flexible because they understand the local food systems, they may also participate in other local fronts of resistance, and may be more aware of the multiple violences related to the industrial food system.

2. Human rights organizations, and in some cases environmental organizations, are relative newcomers to discussions about the meat industry. Human rights organizations often take part in the debate because of a specific case, but they may not continue to work on the issue after that case has closed.
3. Food sovereignty and animal rights/vegan organizations have a longer experience in the debate surrounding meat. However, they can have radically different ways of thinking about the production and consumption of meat.

Animal rights and vegan organization would benefit from taking a systems approach that includes an understanding of the grain-oilseed-livestock complex as well as how it operates through agrarian extractivism. This broader view can enable the formation of alliances with more organizations and activists, and with the communities suffering directly from the impacts of industrial meat production.

4. Both litigation and environmental rights are gaining momentum and there are examples of how they have been mobilized to challenge factory farming. There is also growing attention to the links between environmental issues and the meat industry. For example, in 2024, one of the Goldman Environment Prize winners was an environmental defender denouncing meat production in Brazil.
5. In the future, new topics regarding meat will arise, such as cultivated meat. The different stance taken by organizations regarding technology, the economic and social systems, development, and justice will influence these new debates. But it is important to remember that organizations are not monolithic. Within each type of organization, there may be different views and ideas regarding the best ways of resisting factory farming.
6. Given the multiple differences in organizations' approach to the meat industry, their tactics, and imagined solutions, some alliances may be difficult or even impossible to set up. But given the size and complexity of the current problems with factory meat, finding common ground is likely to be the key to the success of the broad movement to resist it.

8. Conclusions

In this Guidance Memo, I have described how different organizations (human rights, environmental, food sovereignty, and animal rights /vegan organizations) take actions against meat factories in the Americas.

I have argued that to understand how these organizations can form alliances and networks, it is necessary to comprehend the different lens through which these diverse organizations view the meat industry - perspectives that are influenced by how they look upon issues such as economic development, justice, and technology. One also needs to be aware of the full repertoire of their actions which are in turn shaped by the unique goals of each organization.

There are also dissimilarities in how they perceive food systems and what they consider to be good food. On the one hand, human rights, environmental and food sovereignty groups regard agribusiness as a form of extractivism; they tend to denounce the uneven distribution of the harms and benefits of the industrial food system. On the other hand, vegan and animal rights organizations focus on the commodification of animals, and the connection to violence, but may not be concerned with other aspects of the grain-oilseed-livestock complex.

In addition, in the Global North the discussion of meat may differ from that in the Global South. As an interviewee summarized from her experience: In the South the meat industry is continuously associated with land grabbing and environmental conflicts; in the North, there are more discussions of animal welfare and vegetarianism.

In spite of the differences in focus - violence against animals, environmental damage, land rights of the communities, food sovereignty, among others - all these organizations oppose the meat industry in one way or another, and they all agree that the industry generates an array of negative social and environmental impacts.

References

- ARTICLE 19 México y Centroamérica, Acción Ecológica, Asociación Interamericana para la Defensa del Ambiente (AIDA), Asociación Argentina de Abogados Ambientalistas, Cátedra Libre de Soberanía Alimentaria de la Escuela de Nutrición de la Universidad de Buenos Aires, Center for Biological Diversity, Colectivo de Derechos Humanos Yopoi, Conciencia Solidaria, Earthjustice, Kanan Derechos Humanos, Guardianes de los cenotes “Kanan Ts’ono’ot,” Greenpeace México, Movimiento Socioambiental Valle del Huasco, Museo del Hambre, Programa de Derechos Humanos, Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, Red de Abogadas y Abogados por la Soberanía Alimentaria (REDASA), Representantes de la Infancia de Homún, Seminario sobre el Derecho Humano a la Alimentación Adecuada de la Facultad de, Derecho de la UBA, ... Waterkeeper Alliance. (2022). *Solicitud de audiencia temática sobre la situación de los derechos humanos de las personas y comunidades afectadas por las Operaciones Concentradas de Alimentación Animal en el hemisferio*. https://earthjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/audtematicafabricacarneesp_dec2022.pdf
- Barruti, S., Bonomo, I., Colombo, R., Filardi, M., Folguera, G., Svampa, M., & Maristella, E. (2020). *10 mitos y verdades de las megafactorías de cerdos que buscan instalar en Argentina*. <https://www.biodiversidadla.org/Recomendamos/10-mitos-y-verdades-de-las-megafactorias-de-cerdos-que-buscan-instalar-en-Argentina>
- Cantor, A., Stoddard, E., Rocheleau, D., Brewer, J., Roth, R., Birkenholtz, R., Foo, K., & Nirmal, P. (2018). Putting Rooted Networks Into Practice. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, 17(4), 958–987.
- CEDENMA. (2023). Environmental and Social Impacts Policy Failures and Recommendations of IDB Invest and IFC Investments in Pronaca’s Santo Domingo de los Tsáchilas Operations in Ecuador: Environmental and Social Impacts Policy Failures and Recommendations. https://foe.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Final-PRONACA-report_English.5.30.23.pdf

Centro por la Biodiversidad Biológica, Coastal Carolina Riverwatch, Earthjustice, Greenpeace México, Waterkeeper Alliance, Baldwin, L., Cahoon, L., Davis, M., Dolan, F. M., Johnston, J., Lawrence, R. S., Martin, R. P., Quist, A. J. L., Rule, A. M., Thu, K. 2 M., Williams, D., & Wilson, S. M. (2022). *Presentación de Amicus Curiae en relación con el Juicio de Amparo Caso Homún*.

Center for Biological Diversity, World Animal Protection, Global Forest Coalition, Brighter Green, & Aquatic Life Institute. (2024). *The just transition from industrial animal production to equitable, humane and sustainable food systems*. <https://www.worldanimalprotection.org/siteassets/just-transition/just-transition-white-paper.pdf>

Declaración de América sin mega fábricas de cerdos (mega granjas industriales de cerdos). (2022). <https://www.greenpeace.org/static/planet4-mexico-stateless/2>

Emel, J., & Neo, H. (Eds.). (2015). *Political ecologies of meat*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Foer, J. S. (2010). *Eating animals*. Back bay books.

Friends of the Earth. (2022). *Open letter: Stop financing industrial agriculture*. <https://friendsoftheearth.eu/publication/open-letter-stop-financing-industrial-agriculture/>

Gómez-Baggethun, E. (2020). More is more: Scaling political ecology within limits to growth.

Political Geography, 76, 102095. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.102095> 35

Gunderson, R. (2013). From Cattle to Capital: Exchange Value, Animal Commodification, and Barbarism. *Critical Sociology*, 39(2), 259–275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920511421031>

Hudlet, K. (2022). *A human rights approach for resisting CAFOs: The Mayan community of Homun against a 49,000-pig operation in Yucatan, Mexico*. Tiny Beam Fund. <https://doi.org/10.15868/socialsector.40708>

- Huneus, A., Couso, J., & Sieder, R. (2010). Cultures of legality: Judicialization and Political activism in contemporary Latin America. *Cultures of Legality: Judicialization and Political Activism in Latin America*, 3–21.
- Kallis, G. (2018). *Degrowth*. Agenda Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv5cg82g>
- Kotani, I., Succurro, G., Lux, J., & Ahumada, M. (2022). Acuerdo entre China y Argentina para la instalación de megacriaderos: Un debate abierto. *Jornadas de Extensión Rural*, XX. [https://repositorio.inta.gob.ar/bitstream/handle/20.500.12123/15182/INTA_CR_LaPampa - SanLuis_AERVictorica_Lux_J._Acuerdo%20entre%20China%20y%20Argentina%20par a%20la%20instalaci%C3%B3n%20de%20megacriaderos_un%20debate%20abierto.pdf? sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://repositorio.inta.gob.ar/bitstream/handle/20.500.12123/15182/INTA_CR_LaPampa_-_SanLuis_AERVictorica_Lux_J._Acuerdo%20entre%20China%20y%20Argentina%20par%20a%20la%20instalaci%C3%B3n%20de%20megacriaderos_un%20debate%20abierto.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- León Vega, X., & Bravo, E. (2023). Quién financia la producción masiva de carne en Ecuador. *Revista Biodiversidad*, 117, 7–10.
- Lilja, M., Baaz, M., Schulz, M., & Vinthagen, S. (2017). How resistance encourages resistance: Theorizing the nexus between power, ‘Organised Resistance’ and ‘Everyday Resistance.’ *Journal of Political Power*, 10(1), 40–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2017.1286084>
- Martínez-Alier, J. (2023). *Land, Water, Air and Freedom: The Making of World Movements for Environmental Justice*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035312771>
- Martinez-Alier, J., & Walter, M. (2016). Social Metabolism and Conflicts over Extractivism. In F. De Castro, B. Hogenboom, & M. Baud (Eds.), *Environmental Governance in Latin America* (pp. 58–85). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-50572-9_3
- McCarthy, J. (2004). Privatizing conditions of production: Trade agreements as neoliberal environmental governance. *Geoforum*, 35(3), 327–341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2003.07.002>
- McMichael, P. (2009). A food regime analysis of the ‘world food crisis.’ *Agriculture and Human Values*, 26(4), 281–295. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-009-9218-5>

- McNamara, K., Hamerschlag, K., & Stop Financing Factory Farming Campaign. (2023). *Climate Misalignment: How Development Bank Investments in Industrial Livestock Are at Odds With Their Paris Agreement Commitments*.
- Post, E. (2022). Proyectos de muerte and proyectos de vida: Indigenous counter-hegemonic praxis to sustainable development in the Sierra Norte de Puebla, Mexico. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2022.2082286>
- Robbins, P. (2020). Is less more ... or is more less? Scaling the political ecologies of the future. *Political Geography*, 76, 102018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.04.010>
- Rocheleau, D., & Roth, R. (2007). Rooted networks, relational webs and powers of connection: Rethinking human and political ecologies. *Geoforum*, 38(3), 433–437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2006.10.003>
- Schneider, M. (2014). Developing the meat grab. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 41(4), 613– 633. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.918959>
- Sieder, R. (2020). Revisiting the Judicialization of Politics in Latin America. *Latin American Research Review*, 55(1), 159–167.
- Sieder, R., Schjolden, L., & Angell, A. (2005). *The judicialization of politics in Latin America*. Springer.
- Van Den Berg, L., Goris, M. B., Behagel, J. H., Verschoor, G., Turnhout, E., Botelho, M. I. V., & Silva Lopes, I. (2021). Agroecological peasant territories: Resistance and existence in the struggle for emancipation in Brazil. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 48(3), 658–679. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2019.1683001>
- Weis, A. J. (2013). *The ecological hoofprint: The global burden of industrial livestock*. Zed Books.

Annex 1

Vegan and animal rights organizations

1. Anima Naturalis
2. ARBA Perú
3. Aquatic Animal Alliance
4. Come Con Ciencia
5. DxE (Direct Action Everywhere)
6. Eli Sanctuary
7. Fundación Veg
8. Huerta Vida Digna
9. Gen Veg
10. Mercy for Animals
11. Sinergia Animal

Food sovereignty organizations

1. Slow Food
2. Slow Food Chili
3. Grain
4. Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
5. ETC Group
6. Traditional chef Chile
7. Movement against industrial salmon in Chili

Environmental organizations

1. CEDENMA
2. Center for Biological Diversity
3. Centro Mexicano de Derecho Ambiental
4. Global Forest Coalition
5. Greenpeace Mexico
6. Territorios Diversos para la Vida (TerraVida)

Human rights organizations

1. Amnesty International Mexico
2. ARTICLE 19, Mexico and Central America
3. International Accountability Center
4. Kanan Derechos Humanos
5. Lawyer from a case against pig farms in Yucatan
6. Lawyer from a case against pig farms in Yucatan (different NGO)
7. ProDESC



© 2024 Tiny Beam Fund, Inc. All rights reserved.

This Guidance Memo is created under a fellowship award from Tiny Beam Fund, Inc.

All statements, advice, and/or opinions expressed in it are solely those of its author.